

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

**I-75 from M-102 to M-59
Oakland County**



Prepared by

Michigan Department of Transportation

In Cooperation with

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION**

December 2003

This document has been published by authorization of the Director of the State of Michigan's Department of Transportation in keeping with the intent of the *National Environmental Policy Act of 1969* and subsequent implementing regulations and policies that direct agencies to provide the public and other agencies an opportunity to review and comment on proposed projects and alternatives so that potential impacts of the project can be considered and taken into account during the decision-making process. This DEIS has been prepared by MDOT, with the assistance of a team of consultants led by The Corradino Group. The Corradino Group states that it has no financial or other interest in the outcome of the project, other than its professional reputation.

The cost of publishing 150 copies of this document at approximately \$22.40 per copy is \$3,360.00, and the document has been printed in accordance with *Michigan Executive Directive 1991-6*.

**Proposed Widening and Reconstruction
I-75 from M-102 to M-59
Oakland County, Michigan**

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Submitted Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 4332 (2)(c) and 49 U.S.C. 303

**By The
U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration
and
Michigan Department of Transportation**

December 24, 2003

Date of Approval

for

J. C. Hirschstein
FHWA Division Administrator

For additional information concerning the proposed project, or this document, contact:

Mr. Abdelmoez Abdalla
Environmental Program Manager
Federal Highway Administration
315 West Allegan Street, Rm. 207
Lansing, MI 48933
Phone: (517) 702-1820

Ms. Margaret Barondess
Environmental Section Manager
Michigan Dept. of Transportation
P.O. Box 30050
Lansing, MI 48909
Phone: (517) 335-2621

Ms. Sue Datta, AICP
Project Manager
Mi. Dept. of Transportation
18101 West 9 Mile Road
Southfield, MI 48175
Phone: (248) 483-5100

This Draft Environmental Impact Statement describes the social, economic, and natural environmental impacts associated with proposed improvements to 18 miles of I-75 between M-102 (8 Mile Road) and M-59 in Oakland County. This document includes a summary of the planning basis and of the impacts associated with the proposed project and the process to be used in determining the preferred alternative. Mitigation measures are also included. The estimated cost of the proposed project is approximately \$530 million (2003 dollars), depending on the type of interchange built at 12 Mile Road and whether a High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane is built. Eleven residential and two business displacements are anticipated. The estimate of direct wetlands impacts is 0.4 acres (with the HOV Alternative only).

Comments on this Draft Environmental Impact Statement are due 45 days after the date of the public hearing and should be sent to Ms. Sue Datta at the above address.

PREFACE

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 requires that the social, economic, and natural environmental impacts of any proposed action of the federal government be analyzed for decision-making and public information purposes. There are three classes of action. Class I Actions are those that may significantly affect the environment and require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Class II Actions (categorical exclusions) are those that do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the environment and do not require the preparation of an EIS or an Environmental Assessment (EA). Class III Actions are those for which the significance of impacts is not clearly established. Class III Actions require the preparation of an EA to determine the significance of impacts and the appropriate environmental document to be prepared – either an EIS or a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).

This document is a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the proposed widening of I-75 from M-102 (8 Mile Road) to M-59 in Oakland County, Michigan. It describes and analyzes proposed alternatives and the measures taken to minimize harm to the project area. It will be distributed to federal, state, and local agencies for review and comment. A public hearing on this document will then be held. Public and agency comments will be summarized in a Final EIS and responses will be provided. Any necessary changes resulting from the comments will be made. Once these changes and additions have been made, the FEIS will be forwarded to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) with a recommendation that a Record of Decision (ROD) be issued. The ROD will act as the Location/Design Approval document, allowing the project to move forward to the design stage, if approved and when funding is identified. After design is completed the right-of-way acquisition and construction phases will occur. However, at this time, no funding has been identified for activities beyond this environmental / planning stage.

This document was prepared by a consultant working with the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), in cooperation with FHWA. Representatives from the following divisions within MDOT participated: Design, Project Planning, Real Estate, Construction and Technology, Traffic and Safety, and the Metro Region. Information was also furnished by other federal and state agencies, local units of government, public interest groups, an Advisory Council of stakeholders and interested local groups, and individual citizens.

This DEIS may be reviewed at:

- MDOT's Lansing office, 425 West Ottawa Street (third floor), Lansing, MI 48909
- MDOT's Metro Region office - 18101 W. Nine Mile Road, Southfield, MI 48075
- MDOT's Transportation Service Center - 2300 Dixie Highway, Waterford, MI 48238
- Oakland County Community and Economic Development Department - County Service Center, 1200 North Telegraph Road, Building 34 East, Pontiac, MI 48341
- Auburn Hills Library - 3400 East Seyburn Drive, Auburn Hills, MI 48326
- Bloomfield Township Library – 1000 Lone Pine Road, Bloomfield Hills, MI 48302
- Detroit Library - 5201 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, MI 48202
- Ferndale Library – 300 East Nine Mile Road, Ferndale, MI 48220
- Hazel Park Library - 123 East Nine Mile Road, Hazel Park, MI 48030
- Madison Heights Library - 240 West 13 Mile Road, Madison Heights, MI 48071
- Royal Oak Library - 222 East Eleven Mile Road, Royal Oak, MI 48068-0494
- Troy Library - 510 West Big Beaver Rd., Troy, MI 48084

Technical documents referred to in this DEIS that support the decision-making process are available at the three MDOT offices listed above. Summaries of the DEIS and technical documents are available at all locations.

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Preface	ii
 SECTION 1 – SUMMARY	
1.1 Description of the Proposed Project	1-1
1.2 Alternatives	1-3
1.2.1 No Build Alternative	1-3
1.2.2 Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Techniques	1-3
1.2.3 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Techniques	1-3
1.2.4 Intelligent Transportation Systems	1-3
1.2.5 Mass Transit	1-4
1.2.6 Build Alternatives	1-4
1.2.7 Additional Design Considerations	1-5
1.2.8 Practical Alternatives	1-7
1.3 Impacts	1-8
1.3.1 Traffic and Safety	1-8
1.3.2 Relocations and Community Cohesion	1-8
1.3.3 Land Use	1-10
1.3.4 Environmental Justice	1-11
1.3.5 Economics	1-11
1.3.6 Air Quality	1-12
1.3.7 Noise	1-12
1.3.8 Ecological Resources	1-12
1.3.9 Storm Water	1-13
1.3.10 Cultural Resources and Parkland	1-13
1.3.11 Visual Conditions	1-14
1.3.12 Hazardous Materials	1-14
1.3.13 Soils and Utilities	1-14
1.3.14 Indirect and Cumulative Effects	1-15
1.3.15 Energy	1-15
1.3.16 Cost	1-15
1.4 Areas of Controversy	1-16
1.5 Permits	1-16
1.6 Project Status	1-17
 SECTION 2 – PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION	
2.1 Purpose of the Proposed Action	2-1
2.1.1 Project Background	2-1
2.2 Need for the Proposed Action	2-2
2.2.1 Population and Employment Growth	2-2
2.2.2 Existing Traffic and Level of Service	2-4
2.2.3 Future Traffic and Level of Service	2-5
2.2.4 I-75 and Existing Design Standards	2-8
2.2.5 Physical Condition of I-75	2-12
2.2.6 Safety	2-13
2.2.7 Conclusion	2-17

SECTION 3 – ALTERNATIVES

3.1	Alternatives Development.....	3-1
3.2	No Build Alternative	3-2
3.3	Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Techniques	3-2
3.4	Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Techniques	3-2
3.5	Intelligent Transportation Systems.....	3-3
3.6	Mass Transit	3-4
3.7	Build Alternatives	3-6
3.7.1	I-75 Lane Addition for General Purpose Use – GP Alternative.....	3-7
3.7.2	I-75 Lane Addition for HOV Use – HOV Alternative	3-12
3.7.3	Specific Design Issues.....	3-22
3.8	Practical Alternatives	3-30

SECTION 4 – AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

4.1	Relocations	4-1
4.2	Social Impacts/Community Cohesion	4-2
4.2.1	Community Facilities	4-3
4.2.2	Considerations Relating to Pedestrian Access and Bicycle Use	4-12
4.2.3	Considerations Relating to Mass Transit Service and Carpooling	4-16
4.2.4	Maintaining Local and Regional Access During Construction	4-17
4.2.5	Population and Employment Trends	4-17
4.2.6	Other Socioeconomic Characteristics	4-20
4.3	Environmental Justice	4-20
4.4	Economic Impacts and Tax Base Loss	4-23
4.4.1	Economic Background	4-23
4.4.2	Tax Base Loss	4-25
4.5	Land Use and Planning Consistency	4-26
4.6	Farmland/Michigan Act 451, Part 361 Lands/Forest Land	4-26
4.7	Air Quality Analysis.....	4-28
4.8	Noise Analysis.....	4-32
4.8.1	Background and Guiding Criteria	4-32
4.8.2	Existing Noise Conditions.....	4-33
4.8.3	Future Noise Conditions.....	4-34
4.8.4	Noise Mitigation Considerations.....	4-35
4.8.5	Noise Barrier Analysis	4-36
4.9	Threatened and Endangered Species	4-48
4.10	Surface Water Features/Water Quality/Floodplains.....	4-49
4.10.1	Waterways and Drains	4-49
4.10.2	Water Quality and Groundwater	4-54
4.10.3	Floodways and Floodplains.....	4-55
4.11	Wetlands.....	4-55
4.11.1	Methodology	4-55
4.11.2	Wetland Functions and Priorities	4-56
4.11.3	Delineation Summary.....	4-57
4.11.4	Impacts	4-57
4.12	Historic and Archaeological Resources – Section 106.....	4-58
4.13	Parkland – Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) Resources.....	4-59
4.14	Visual Conditions	4-59
4.15	Contaminated Sites.....	4-60
4.16	Soils and Utilities	4-63

4.17	Construction Permits	4-63
4.18	Indirect and Cumulative Impacts	4-63
4.18.1	Indirect Impact Summary	4-64
4.18.2	Cumulative Impact Summary	4-65
4.19	Energy	4-67
4.20	Cost	4-67
4.21	The Relationship Between Local Short-Term Uses of the Environment and the Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity	4-67
4.22	Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources Which Would be Involved in the Proposed Action	4-68

SECTION 5 – MITIGATION OF IMPACTS

5.1	Right-of-Way Acquisition and Relocation Impacts	5-1
5.2	Noise Walls	5-2
5.3	Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control	5-2
5.4	River, Stream and Drain Crossings	5-3
5.5	Environmental Permits	5-3
5.6	Existing Vegetation	5-4
5.7	Disposal of Surplus or Unsuitable Material	5-5
5.8	Groundwater Quality	5-5
5.9	Surface Water Quality	5-6
5.10	Maintaining Traffic During Construction	5-6
5.11	Continuance of Public Utility Service	5-7
5.12	Construction Noise and Vibration Impacts	5-7
5.13	Control of Air Pollution During Construction	5-8
5.14	Wetland Mitigation	5-8
5.15	National Geodetic Survey Monuments	5-10
5.16	Additional Mitigation or Modifications	5-10

SECTION 6 – EARLY COORDINATION, PUBLIC MEETINGS, AND SCHEDULE

6.1	Early Coordination	6-1
6.1.1	Federal Agencies	6-1
6.1.2	State Agencies	6-2
6.1.3	Local Agencies	6-2
6.2	Public Meetings and Public Involvement	6-2
6.3	Next Steps - Schedule	6-4

SECTION 7 – LIST OF PREPARERS

7-1

SECTION 8 – DISTRIBUTION LIST

8-1

APPENDICES

Appendix A	Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan	A-1
Appendix B	Scoping and Correspondence	B-1

I:\projects\3070\wp\reports\deis\textW-Figs.doc

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1	Existing Conditions and Proposed Project	1-2
Figure 2-1	2002 and 2025 Level of Service – Morning Peak	2-6
Figure 2-2	2002 and 2025 Level of Service – Morning Peak	2-7
Figure 3-1	Mass Transit Alternative	3-5
Figure 3-2	Lane Additions on I-75	3-8
Figure 3-3	Pedestrian Bridges Reconstruction.....	3-9
Figure 3-4a	Existing and Proposed Typical Sections Depressed Area.....	3-13
Figure 3-4b	Existing and Proposed Typical Sections Rural Area.....	3-14
Figure 3-5	9 Mile Curve Redesign Impacts	3-15
Figure 3-6	Basic HOV Example Facilities	3-17
Figure 3-7	Examples of Special HOV Access at 9 Mile Road and North of Big Beaver	3-18
Figure 3-8	HOV Lane – Northbound Through Square Lake Interchange	3-19
Figure 3-9	Travel Desire Analysis – Square Lake Road to M-59.....	3-23
Figure 3-10	Left Exit/Entrance Switch to Right	3-24
Figure 3-11	Southbound Lane Use M-59 to Square Lake	3-25
Figure 3-12	I-696 Ramp Braiding	3-26
Figure 3-13a	12 Mile Road Single Point Urban Interchange	3-28
Figure 3-13b	12 Mile Road Interchange Reconstruction.....	3-29
Figure 3-14	14 Mile Road Interchange Reconstruction.....	3-31
Figure 4-1	Existing Community Facilities.....	4-4
Figure 4-2	Census Tracts Along I-75.....	4-21
Figure 4-3	Oakland County 2002 Land Use	4-27
Figure 4-4	Emission Factor Trends – PM _{2.5}	4-32
Figure 4-5	Environmental Information	4-39
Figure 5-1	Wetland Impact and Mitigation Sites	5-9

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1-1	Summary of Impacts – General Purpose and HOV Lane Alternatives	1-9
Table 2-1	Oakland County I-75 Corridor – Population 1980 to 2030.....	2-3
Table 2-2	Oakland County I-75 Corridor – Employment 1990 to 2030.....	2-3
Table 2-3	Existing (2002) Peak Hour Traffic Volumes and LOS for I-75.....	2-5
Table 2-4	2025 Peak Hour Traffic Volumes and LOS for I-75 – No Build Alternative	2-8
Table 2-5	2025 Peak Hour Traffic Volumes and LOS for I-75 – Build Alternatives.....	2-8
Table 2-6	I-75 Roadway Features in Relation to Modern Standards	2-10
Table 2-7	Existing I-75 Sufficiency Ratings	2-13
Table 2-8	Crash Data by Segment.....	2-14
Table 2-9	Summary of Crash Countermeasures.....	2-18
Table 3-1	Rapid Transit Station Activity	3-6
Table 3-2	Impacts of HOV Options	3-20
Table 3-3	HOV Tests – 2025 PM Peak Hour – Northbound – 20% Violation Rate	3-21
Table 3-4	HOV Tests – 2025 PM Peak Hour – Southbound – No Violators	3-21
Table 3-5	Level of Service – 12 and 14 Mile Road Interchange Options.....	3-27
Table 3-6	Build Alternatives Impact Summary	3-32
Table 4-1	Relocation Summary.....	4-2
Table 4-2	Sidewalk and Shoulder Conditions – Existing and With Project.....	4-15
Table 4-3	Average Daily MDOT Carpool Lot Use	4-16
Table 4-4	Population and Household Growth	4-18
Table 4-5	Socioeconomic Characteristics	4-19
Table 4-6	Minority and Low-Income Populations in Contiguous Census Tracts	4-22
Table 4-7	Commuting to and from Oakland County.....	4-24
Table 4-8	Changes in State Equalized Value	4-25
Table 4-9	Tax Base Loss (2002 dollars).....	4-25
Table 4-10	National Ambient Air Quality Standards.....	4-28
Table 4-11	CO Concentrations.....	4-31
Table 4-12	Noise Abatement Criteria.....	4-33
Table 4-13	Existing and Future Noise Levels	4-34
Table 4-14	Noise Barrier Analysis	4-38
Table 4-15	Waterway Crossing Characteristics	4-50
Table 4-16	Summary of Wetland Characteristics – Impacted Wetlands.....	4-58
Table 4-17	Estimated Wetland Impacts and Potential Compensatory Mitigation.....	4-58
Table 4-18	Contamination Summary	4-61

